

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests further examination and consideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, 17, 18, 20, 24-26 and 30-42 were previously pending in this application. Within the previous Office Action, Claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, 17, 18, 20, 24-26 and 30-42 have been rejected. This rejection was maintained within the Advisory Action mailed on February 3, 2005. By the above amendment, new Claim 43 has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, 17, 18, 20, 24-26 and 30-43 are currently pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102

Within the previous Office Action, Claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, 17, 18, 20, 24-26 and 30-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the published European Patent Application No. EP 0 812 092 A2 to Makoto Sato et al. (hereinafter "Sato"). The applicants respectfully disagree.

Sato teaches a method and system for controlling the communication of electronic equipment. Sato teaches a controlling device transmitting a notify command to a target device, receiving an interim response from the target device and transmitting a notify (cancel) command. [Sato, Abstract] Sato teaches that the controller transmits a cancel command to the target, requesting the target to discontinue the execution of the notify command. [Sato, col. 13, lines 4-7] Sato does not teach sending a status command to cancel a pending notify command, wherein the status command is sent while the pending notify command is pending. Sato also does not teach sending a duplicate notify command to cancel a pending notify command, wherein the duplicate of the pending notify command is sent while the pending notify command is pending. The cancel command taught by Sato to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command is a dedicated "cancel" command. Sato does not teach sending a status command or a duplicate of the pending notify command, to cancel a pending notify command.

In contrast to the teachings of Sato, the method and apparatus for cancelling a pending notify command, of the present invention, includes a mechanism which allows a controlling device to cancel a pending notify command by sending a status command or a duplicate notify command while the pending notify command is still pending. A target device which receives a notify command from a controlling device, first sends an interim response to the controlling device. When the state of the target device changes, the target device then sends a notify response to the controlling device. Before the state of the target device changes, while the notify

command is pending, if the target device receives the cancelling command, the target device then cancels the pending notify command. In one embodiment, the cancelling command is a status command sent while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a cancelling command to cancel a pending notify command, wherein the cancelling command is a status command sent while the pending notify command is pending. In another embodiment, the cancelling command is a duplicate of the pending notify command sent while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a cancelling command to cancel a pending notify command, wherein the cancelling command is a duplicate of the pending notify command sent while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, the cancel command taught by Sato to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command is a dedicated "cancel" command. Sato does not teach using a status command or a duplicate of the pending notify command, to cancel a pending notify command.

Within the Response to Arguments section in the previous Office Action, it is stated that Sato teaches transmission of a status command at column 6, lines 20-55. From this it is concluded that it is within the scope of Sato to replace the "cancel" command with either a status command or a duplicate notify command. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Within this cited section of Sato, the features of an inquiry command, status command and notify command are discussed. However, nowhere in this cited section nor the remainder of Sato is it taught to send a status command or a duplicate of the pending notify command, to cancel a pending notify command. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated "cancel" command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command.

Within the Advisory Action mailed on February 3, 2005, the position is taken that Sato teaches sending *any* second command to cancel *any* pending command. The applicants respectfully disagree. This simply cannot be supported by the teachings of Sato. Sato specifically teaches sending a dedicated "cancel" command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. [Sato, col. 13, lines 4-7 and 38-42] Sato teaches that this dedicated "cancel" command is a modified notify command, not a duplicate of the original notify command. [Sato, col. 13, lines 38-42] As taught within Sato

[t]he notify (cancel) command is a kind of notify command to request the target to discontinue the execution of the previous notify command. Typically, a notify (cancel) command is formed by replacing 'dummy' in the OPR field in the format of a notify command by 'cancel'. [Sato, col. 13, lines 38-42]

Thus, the dedicated cancel command taught by Sato specifically includes 'cancel' within the command itself. Contrary to the assertion within the Advisory Action, Sato does not teach that *any* pending command can be canceled by sending *any* other command. As discussed above, in contrast to the teachings of Sato, one embodiment of the present invention utilizes an exact duplicate of the pending notify command sent while the pending notify command is pending to cancel the pending notify command. Sato teaches sending a modified notify command which includes 'cancel within the command. In further contrast to the teachings of Sato, another embodiment of the present invention utilizes a status command sent while the pending notify command is pending to cancel the pending notify command. Nowhere does Sato teach canceling a pending notify command by sending a status command.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of cancelling a pending notify command at a target device. The method of Claim 1 comprises sending a cancelling command over a network from a controlling device to the target device, wherein the cancelling command is a status command sent while the pending notify command is pending and cancelling the pending notify command at the target device when the cancelling command is received while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated "cancel" command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a status command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

Claims 5 and 6 are dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Sato. Accordingly, Claims 5 and 6 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 7 is directed to a target device for communicating with a controlling device over a network. The target device of Claim 7 comprises means for communicating with the controlling device over the network, the means for communicating including ability to receive a notify command from the controlling device, issue an interim response to the notify command to the controlling device and receive a cancelling command from the controlling device, wherein the cancelling command is a status command sent while the pending notify command is pending and means for cancelling coupled to the means for communicating for cancelling a pending notify command if a cancelling command is received from the controlling device while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated "cancel" command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a status command to

cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 7 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

Claims 11 and 12 are dependent upon the independent Claim 7. As discussed above, the independent Claim 7 is allowable over the teachings of Sato. Accordingly, Claims 11 and 12 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 13 is directed to a target device configured to communicate with a controlling device over a network. The target device of Claim 13 comprises an interface circuit configured to communicate with the controlling device over the network, the interface circuit including ability to receive a notify command from the controlling device, issue an interim response to the notify command and receive a cancelling command from the controlling device, wherein the cancelling command is a status command sent while the pending notify command is pending and a control circuit coupled to the interface circuit to cancel a pending notify command if a cancelling command is received from the controlling device while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a status command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 13 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

Claims 17 and 18 are dependent upon the independent Claim 13. As discussed above, the independent Claim 13 is allowable over the teachings of Sato. Accordingly, Claims 17 and 18 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 20 is directed to a network of devices coupled together comprising a controlling device configured to send a cancelling command to cancel a pending notify command, wherein the cancelling command is a status command sent while the pending notify command is pending and a target device including an interface circuit configured to communicate with the controlling device to receive the cancelling command from the controlling device and a control circuit coupled to the interface circuit to cancel a pending notify command if the cancelling command is received from the controlling device while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a status command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

Claims 24 and 25 are dependent upon the independent Claim 20. As discussed above, the independent Claim 20 is allowable over the teachings of Sato. Accordingly, Claims 24 and 25 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 26 is directed to a network of devices coupled together by a standard IEEE 1394 serial bus comprising a controlling device in communication with the standard IEEE 1394 serial bus and configured for sending a cancelling command over the standard IEEE 1394 serial bus, wherein the cancelling command is a status command sent while the pending notify command is pending and a target device in communication with the standard IEEE 1394 serial bus and configured for receiving the cancelling command and cancelling a pending notify command if the cancelling command is received while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a status command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 26 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

The independent Claim 30 is directed to a method of cancelling a pending notify command at a target device. The method of Claim 30 comprises sending a cancelling command over a network from a controlling device to the target device, wherein the cancelling command is a duplicate of the pending notify command sent while the pending notify command is pending and cancelling the pending notify command at the target device when the cancelling command is received while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a duplicate of the pending notify command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 30 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

Claims 31 and 32 are dependent upon the independent Claim 30. As discussed above, the independent Claim 30 is allowable over the teachings of Sato. Accordingly, Claims 31 and 32 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 32 is directed to a target device for communicating with a controlling device over a network. The target device of Claim 32 comprises means for communicating with the controlling device over the network, the means for communicating including ability to receive a notify command from the controlling device, issue an interim response to the notify command to the controlling device and receive a cancelling command from the controlling device, wherein the cancelling command is a duplicate of the pending notify

command sent while the pending notify command is pending and means for cancelling coupled to the means for communicating for cancelling a pending notify command if a cancelling command is received from the controlling device while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a duplicate of the pending notify command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

Claims 34 and 35 are dependent upon the independent Claim 33. As discussed above, the independent Claim 33 is allowable over the teachings of Sato. Accordingly, Claims 34 and 35 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 36 is directed to a target device configured to communicate with a controlling device over a network. The target device of Claim 36 comprises an interface circuit configured to communicate with the controlling device over the network, the interface circuit including ability to receive a notify command from the controlling device, issue an interim response to the notify command and receive a cancelling command from the controlling device, wherein the cancelling command is a duplicate of the pending notify command sent while the pending notify command is pending and a control circuit coupled to the interface circuit to cancel a pending notify command if a cancelling command is received from the controlling device while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a duplicate of the pending notify command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

Claims 37 and 38 are dependent upon the independent Claim 36. As discussed above, the independent Claim 36 is allowable over the teachings of Sato. Accordingly, Claims 37 and 38 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 39 is directed to a network of devices coupled together comprising a controlling device configured to send a cancelling command to cancel a pending notify command, wherein the cancelling command is a duplicate of the pending notify command sent while the pending notify command is pending and a target device. The target device includes an interface circuit configured to communicate with the controlling device to receive the cancelling command from the controlling device and a control circuit coupled to the interface circuit to cancel a pending notify command if the cancelling command is received from the

controlling device while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a duplicate of the pending notify command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 39 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

Claims 40 and 41 are dependent upon the independent Claim 39. As discussed above, the independent Claim 39 is allowable over the teachings of Sato. Accordingly, Claims 40 and 41 are both also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 42 is directed to a network of devices coupled together by a standard IEEE 1394 serial bus. The network of devices of Claim 42 comprises a controlling device in communication with the standard IEEE 1394 serial bus and configured for sending a cancelling command over the standard IEEE 1394 serial bus, wherein the cancelling command is a duplicate of the pending notify command sent while the pending notify command is pending and a target device in communication with the standard IEEE 1394 serial bus and configured for receiving the cancelling command and cancelling a pending notify command if the cancelling command is received while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a duplicate of the pending notify command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 42 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

The new independent Claim 43 is directed to a method of communicating between a controlling device and a target device. The method of Claim 43 comprises sending a notify command from the controlling device to the target device thereby establishing a pending notify command, sending the notify command a second time from the controlling device to the target device, while the pending notify command is pending, as a cancelling command and cancelling the pending notify command at the target device when the notify command is received while the pending notify command is pending. As discussed above, Sato teaches sending a dedicated “cancel” command to discontinue the execution of a pending notify command. As also discussed above, Sato does not teach sending a duplicate of the pending notify command to cancel a pending notify command. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 43 is allowable over the teachings of Sato.

For the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending Claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: February 10, 2005

By: Jonathan O. Owens
Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No.: 37,902
Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING (39)

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

- 15 -

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 2-10-05 By: Jonathan O. Owens